

describes a client request for content communicated through the network toward a home or origin server. In contrast, the present invention describes a response (the MRF) to the client request provided by a home or origin server communicated through the network away from the home or origin server. The Yates reference describes a technique for intercepting the client request and responding to the content request directly from a cache server. In contrast, the present invention describes a technique for modifying a response (the MRF) by modifying the instructions in the MRF that designate the location of the content, and the client then receives the MRF and obtains the requested content based on the location (local cache) indicated in the MRF. Because the Yates reference does not recite or suggest the response instruction modification aspect of the present invention as described in the Specification and recited in Claim 1, then Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Claims 2-10 and 12-13 depend from base Claim 1 and therefore contain all of the elements of Claim 1. Any limitations recited by Claims 2-10 and 12-13 serve to further distinguish Claims 1-10 and 12-13 from Yates. Therefore, for the above stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-10 and 12-13.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended Claim 11 to include all of the limitations of the base Claim 1 from which Claim 11 depends. Amended Claim 11 should now be allowable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to Claim 11.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (978) 341-0036.



Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By J. Scott Southworth

J. Scott Southworth

Registration No. 39,382

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: March 5, 2002

A